

5

STALIN SPEAKS for PEACE

interview of February 16, 1951

Full text of Premier Stalin's

We believe that the interview granted by Premier Stalin to the Pravda correspondent on February 16, 1951 is of great importance to the American people as well as all other people striving for peace. Therefore, in order to give opportunity to the largest possible number of people to learn the contents of Premier Stalin's statement, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship is publishing the full text of the interview as a public service.

The American people are showing a growing concern for the preservation of peace. This is evidenced by the steady growth of the peace movement in our country. We believe that Premier Stalin's reiteration of the desire of the Soviet people for peace, and his pledge that the USSR will continue its work for the maintenance of international peace, will find a sympathetic response from the people of the United States.

We strongly urge that our national Administration and Congress take up the peace proffer of Premier Stalin and endeavor to arrange a Truman-Stalin conference to examine the world situation with a view of finding peaceful solutions to problems that endanger the peace.

We ask all peace-loving people to urge upon President Truman to act in the tradition of his great predecessor in office, the late President Roosevelt, and seek solution to difficult problems in a face-to-face conference with Premier Stalin. Our people remember that many difficulties which seemed insurmountable were solved in such conferences by the heads of the two governments. Above all, the initiative taken by Premier Stalin for peace at this time of mounting danger to war, must not be allowed to pass unheeded by the United States. The people of America and the people the world over are anxious for peace and would wholeheartedly support a response from our President to the Stalin bid for peace. Let us act now! Write or wire President Truman to call for a Conference with Premier Stalin.

QUESTION: How do you estimate the latest statement made by British Prime Minister Attlee in the House of Commons to the effect that after the termination of the war the Soviet Union did not disarm, i.e., did not demobilize its troops and that since then the Soviet Union is constantly increasing its armed forces?

ANSWER: I estimate this statement made by Prime Minister Attlee as a slander against the Soviet Union. It is known to the whole world that the Soviet Union demobilized its troops after the war. As is known, demobilization was carried out in three stages:

The first and second stages, in the course of the year 1945; the third stage, from May to September, 1946. In addition, the demobilization of older age groups of the personnel of the Soviet army was carried out in 1946 and 1947, and in the beginning of 1948 all the rest of the older age groups were demobilized.

Such are the facts known to everyone.

If Prime Minister Attlee were competent in financial or economic science, he would have realized without difficulty that not a single state, the Soviet Union included, could develop civilian industry to the full, launch great construction projects like the hydroelectric power stations on the Volga and Dnieper and the Amu Darya [Oxus], which demand scores of hundreds of thousands of millions in budget expenditure, continue the policy of systematic price reduction for consumer goods which also demands scores of thousands of millions in budget expenditure, invest hundreds of thousands of millions in the restoration of the national economy destroyed by the German invaders, and together simultaneously with this multiply its armed forces and develop war industry.

It is not difficult to understand that so reckless a policy would have led any state to bankruptcy.

Prime Minister Attlee should have known by his own experience as well as by the experience of the United States that the multiplication of a country's armed forces and an arms race lead to developing war industry, to curtailing civilian industry, to stopping great civilian construction

work, to increased taxation, to a rise in prices for consumer goods.

It stands to reason that if the Soviet Union is not reducing but on the contrary is expanding its civilian industry, it is not winding up but on the contrary expanding the construction of new civilian hydroelectric power stations and irrigation systems, is not stopping but on the contrary continuing the policy of price reduction, it cannot simultaneously with this inflate war industry and multiply its armed forces without risking finding itself in a state of bankruptcy.

If despite all these facts and scientific considerations, Prime Minister Attlee considers it nevertheless possible openly to slander the Soviet Union and its peaceful policy, this can only be explained by the fact that by slandering the Soviet Union he thinks it is possible to justify the armaments race in Britain now being carried out by the Labor Government.

Prime Minister Attlee needs a lie against the Soviet Union, and it is essential to him to depict the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union as an aggressive one and the aggressive policy of the British Government as a peaceful one in order to mislead the British people, to impose upon them that lie about the U.S.S.R. and thus to draw them by means of deceit into the new world war being organized by the ruling circles of the United States.

Prime Minister Attlee represents himself to be a supporter of peace. However, if he is really in favor of peace, why did he reject the proposal of the Soviet Union in the United Nations Organization for the immediate conclusion of a peace pact between the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States of America, China and France?

If he truly stands for peace, why did he reject the proposals of the Soviet Union for an immediate start on the reduction of armaments, for the immediate prohibition of atomic weapons?

If he is really in favor of peace, why does he persecute the fighters of peace, why did he prohibit the peace congress in Britain? Can a campaign in defense of peace threaten Britain's security?

It is obvious that Prime Minister Attlee is not in favor of

preserving peace, but of unleashing a new aggressive world war.

QUESTION: What do you think of the intervention in Korea? How could it end?

ANSWER: If Britain and the United States reject finally the proposals made by the People's Government of China, the war in Korea can only end in a defeat of the interventionists.

QUESTION: Why is it possible that the American and British generals and officers are worse than the Chinese and the Korean ones?

ANSWER: No, they are not worse. American and British generals and officers are in no way worse than the generals and officers of any other country.

As to the soldiers of the United States and Britain, as is known, they showed themselves in the best light in the war against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan. Wherein lies the crux of the matter then? It lies in the fact that the soldiers regard the war against Korea and China as unjust, whereas they regarded the war against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan as completely just.

The matter at issue is that this war is extremely unpopular among the American and British soldiers. Indeed, it is difficult to convince the soldiers that China, which is not threatening either Britain or the United States, and from which the Americans appropriated the island of Taiwan (Formosa), is the aggressor, whereas the United States, which appropriated the island of Taiwan and brought its troops to the very boundaries of China, is the party defending itself.

It is difficult to convince the soldiers that the United States of America is entitled to defend its security on the territory of Korea and at the frontiers of China, whereas China and Korea have no right to defend their security on their own territory or at the frontiers of their states. This is the reason why the war is unpopular among the Anglo-American soldiers.

the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as aggressive. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans to draw them into a new war.

Precisely for this reason they are afraid of the campaign in defense of peace, fearing that it can expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments. Precisely for this reason they turned down the proposal of the Soviet Government for the conclusion of a peace pact, for the reduction of armaments, for banning the atomic weapon, fearing that the adoption of these proposals would undermine the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and make the armaments race unnecessary.

What will be the end of this struggle of the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new World War.

That is why the wide campaign for the maintenance of peace as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers is now of first rate importance.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future as well firmly to pursue a policy of averting war and maintaining peace.

Quantities of this folder at the rate of \$1.00 per hundred or \$5.00 per thousand can be ordered from
The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship
114 East 32nd Street • New York 16, New York
Suite 803